



1927

U.S. Supreme Court Decisions

North Dakota Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr>

Recommended Citation

North Dakota Law Review (1927) "U.S. Supreme Court Decisions," *North Dakota Law Review*: Vol. 4 : No. 6 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://commons.und.edu/ndlr/vol4/iss6/5>

This Decision is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in North Dakota Law Review by an authorized editor of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.commonson@library.und.edu.

edge by the entrant or maker, may be shown to affect weight, but they shall not affect its admissibility. The term business shall include business, profession, occupation and calling of every kind."

U. S. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

P., a resident of New Jersey, while driving a team hitched to a wagon, was run into by W., a resident of Pennsylvania. The accident occurred on a New Jersey highway, and P. was injured. Under a statute providing that the owner or operator of a motor vehicle, not licensed as provided by law, who accepted privilege of driving on New Jersey highways, should, by such acceptance, constitute the Secretary of State his agent for acceptance of service of process in civil suits for damages arising from accident or collision, suit was brought in New Jersey and judgment entered. W. appealed, contending that service was invalid under the 14th amendment. HELD: A state has the right to compel the registration of non-residents who use its roads, and to provide that the use of such roads by those who do not register shall be deemed consent to appointment of a designated state officer to accept service of process, but the act must contain provisions making it reasonably probable that the non-resident defendant will receive notice of the substituted service. Every statute of this kind, therefore, should require the plaintiff bringing the suit to show in the summons to be served the post office address or residence of the defendant being sued, and should impose either on the plaintiff himself or upon the official receiving service, or some other person, the duty of communication by mail or otherwise with the defendant.—*Wuchter vs. Pizzutti*, *Sup. Ct. Rep.* 48-259.

Plaintiff association was incorporated under the Bingham Act of Kentucky, which authorizes the incorporation of non-profit, co-operative associations for marketing agricultural products, provides that only producers may become members and that the corporation may contract only with them for marketing such products, declares, further, that these contracts shall not be illegal, fixes penalties for interference, and provides that the association shall not be deemed a conspiracy, illegal combination or monopoly. One K. joined the association, made the standard contract, but afterwards sold his product to the defendant company, which disposed of the same despite the fact that it had been notified of the contract and reminded of the penalties in case of such disposition. HELD: The states may, in the protection of agriculture, sanction contracts of producers for the sale of the entire crop to cooperative marketing agencies and penalize the breach of the same. They may modify the common law in this respect by declaring that such contracts shall not be deemed combinations in restraint of trade. Case distinguished from *Conolly vs. Union Sewer Pipe Co.* upon ground that the statute there expressly exempted from its operation agricultural products and live stock in the hands of producers or raisers, and thereby denied the equal protection of law to the Sewer Pipe Co.—*Liberty Warehouse Co. vs. Burley Tobacco Growers' Co-operative Marketing Association*, *Sup. Ct. Rep.* 48-291.